United Nations A/C.3/60/SR.45

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
8 December 2005

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 45th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 21 November 2005, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Butagira ..... (Uganda)
later: Ms. Tomič (Vice-Chairman) ..... (Slovenia)
later: Mr. Butagira ..... (Uganda)

Contents

Agenda item 67: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 68: Indigenous issues (*continued*)

Agenda item 70: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 71: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-61194 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 67: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.19)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.19: The situation of and assistance to Palestinian children

1. **The Chairman** said that draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.19 contained no programme-budget implications.

2. **Ms. Rasheed** (Observer for Palestine), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that her delegation had decided to withdraw the draft resolution in the interest of streamlining the work of the United Nations. The decision had been prompted by the conclusion of negotiations on a draft resolution sponsored by the European Union which had incorporated much of its language and would be adopted by consensus.

3. The draft resolution had been put forward to address the plight of Palestinian children living under Israeli occupation who had been deprived of their most basic rights, including the right to life and personal security. Children had borne the brunt of Israel's escalated military attacks against densely populated areas, resulting in the killing of hundreds of Palestinian children in the wake of the second Palestinian uprising against Israel's occupation and its illegal policies and practices. The draft resolution was meant to send a strong message of solidarity to the Palestinian people and to reflect the deep concern of the international community for the well-being and safety of Palestinian children.

Agenda item 68: Indigenous issues (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.23/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.23/Rev.1: Programme of Action for the Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People

4. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

5. **Ms. Tincopa** (Peru) introduced the revised draft resolution on behalf of the original sponsors as well as Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Burkina Faso, El Salvador, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Nicaragua, Norway, the Philippines, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and South Africa. She said that, in the ninth preambular paragraph, the words "as appropriate" should be inserted after the word "continue".

6. **Ms. Nassau** (Australia) said that, while her delegation supported the Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous People and initiatives to raise the profile of indigenous people internationally, such as the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, it disagreed with some elements of the Programme of Action for the Second Decade (A/60/270). Her delegation could not agree to encourage States to ratify the draft convention on the protection of the diversity of cultural contents and artistic expressions, as stated in paragraph 14 of the Programme, as it had concerns that that might allow States to implement measures which conflicted with their obligations under other international agreements, particularly on trade and intellectual property. Her delegation was also concerned by the extensive references to the undefined principle of free, prior and informed consent.

7. She noted a factual error in paragraph 58 of the Programme of Action regarding the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. The reference to "protection" should be amended to read "respect, preservation and maintenance" in keeping with article 8 (j) of the Convention. Notwithstanding those points, Australia would join the consensus on the draft resolution, which reflected its commitment to advancing indigenous issues over the coming decade.

8. **Ms. Pi** (Uruguay), speaking on behalf of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR) and its associated States Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, said that MERCOSUR fully supported the draft resolution and the five key objectives put forward in paragraph 9 of the Programme of Action, which was crucial for the promotion and protection of the rights as well as the development of such people. All actors concerned should cooperate constructively to that end and should finalize the draft declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples.

9. **Mr. Wood** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that it supported much of the draft resolution and fully shared the concern of the sponsors that many indigenous people did not enjoy their full human rights. The situation indeed deserved continued international attention. As human rights

were universal and equal for all individuals, however, there could not be some human rights that only certain groups enjoyed. With the exception of the right to self-determination, which applied to all peoples under the International Covenants on Human Rights, the European Union did not accept the concept of collective rights in international law.

10. The rights granted to indigenous populations at the national level remained distinct from human rights, which were founded in international human-rights law and applied to every individual without distinction. As the second and third preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution sought directly to link collective rights to international human-rights law, the European Union would be forced to vote against those provisions if a vote were taken. In the absence of a vote, however, it would join the consensus on the draft as a whole as a demonstration of support for the broad thrust of its content.

11. **Ms. Zach** (United States of America), noting the importance of ensuring non-discrimination against indigenous people at the workplace, at the polls and in social settings as well as promoting their capacity to manage local affairs with a measure of autonomy, said that her Government would join consensus on the draft resolution. Governments must take steps to achieve equal opportunity in their societies. The draft declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples would provide the necessary context for the term "indigenous people". There was some confusion in the text of the draft resolution over the words "indigenous people" and "indigenous peoples". The United States called on delegations to show the necessary flexibility to reach consensus on a strong aspirational declaration on the rights of indigenous people during the current year.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.23/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

13. **Mr. Chew** (Singapore) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution in order to express its increasing concern about the way in which people belonging to particular religions had become convenient scapegoats for many of the world's injustices. The irresponsible defamation of religions created mutual suspicion and tensions and did not bode well for international peace and harmony. The tendency of the mass media to generalize, caricaturize and sensationalize for the purposes of selling stories only compounded matters. Moreover, the common practice of stereotyping people had further contributed to the wrongful entrenchment of baseless fears and to the erroneous portrayal of cultural and religious beliefs and practices. A swift reaction should be taken against any sign of ethnic, cultural or religious defamation in order to give a clear warning of its dangers and to stem the flow of harmful rhetoric that could lead to the incitement of violence.

14. Singapore was a small multiracial, multireligious State without a common cultural heritage. Nevertheless, its people had managed to live and work together harmoniously since independence because they recognized their diversity and the value of cooperation and harmony. His delegation wished to stress that the draft resolution just adopted applied equally to all religions.

Agenda item 70: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.59)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.59: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

15. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

16. **Mr. Hayee** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Armenia, Jordan, Lebanon and Thailand had joined in sponsoring the draft.

17. He said that, in the seventh preambular paragraph, the words "recalling resolution" should be inserted before "60/1"; he also made two minor corrections to that paragraph.

18. The right to self-determination enjoyed primacy in international law, was the cornerstone of the Charter and the two International Covenants, and had been reaffirmed at the High-level Plenary Meeting of the sixtieth session of the General Assembly. The adoption of the resolution by acclamation ever since its introduction epitomized the General Assembly's consistent reaffirmation of the central principle of the Charter. It also sent a powerful message regarding the international community's opposition to foreign aggression and occupation, which were contrary to international human-rights and humanitarian law.

19. The sponsors of the draft resolution had engaged in a dialogue with their partners with a genuine desire to accommodate their concerns. However, some of their proposals, while useful, might have drastically

altered the text. The current text was therefore similar to that adopted at previous sessions.

20. **The Chairman** said that Angola, China, the Congo, Guinea, Nigeria and Singapore wished to co-sponsor the draft resolution.

21. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.59, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Explanations of position

22. **Mr. Wood** (United Kingdom) speaking on behalf of the European Union as well as Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Republic of Moldova, Norway, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and Ukraine, said that the right of peoples to self-determination was a pillar of international law which remained relevant and deserved close attention from the international community. It was closely associated with respect for all human rights, democracy and the rule of law. Civil and political rights could contribute towards the enjoyment of economic, social and cultural rights, thus underlining that all human rights were universal, indivisible, interrelated and interdependent.

23. The countries for which he spoke would have welcomed the opportunity for a more detailed discussion on the draft text and the proposed amendments. The thrust of the draft resolution remained too narrow and should have reflected more clearly the practice of self-determination under international law. Moreover, the text contained a number of inaccuracies under international law. According to the International Covenants, the right to self-determination applied only to peoples, not nations. Furthermore, it was incorrect to suggest that self-determination was a precondition for the enjoyment of all human rights. Lastly, the right of return should have been reflected in accordance with article 13 (2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

24. Such weaknesses undermined the quality of the debate that should be taking place on the issue. The text proposed for adoption at the following session should be more effective in encouraging all States to respect their obligations in connection with the right of peoples to self-determination.

25. **Mr. Ritter** (Liechtenstein) said that his country had been a longstanding supporter of the right to self-determination, based on the understanding that the exercise of that right could not simply be equated with the right to independence. Viewed more broadly as entailing various forms of self-administration and self-governance, the right to self-determination could offer new perspectives for peaceful coexistence in the absence of independent statehood. For that reason, his country had consistently advocated a staged approach which was not restricted to the particular situation of certain peoples but rather encompassed all peoples and allowed for the discussion of different forms of self-governance and self-administration.

26. The way in which the current draft resolution had been promoted, however, did not leave any room for discussion of the merits of a broader approach which would more accurately reflect the title of the draft. While his delegation had joined the consensus, it noted with regret that the draft resolution represented a failed opportunity to address the issue of self-determination in a creative and constructive way.

27. **Ms. Melon** (Argentina) said that the text of the draft resolution just adopted should be interpreted and applied in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Special Political and Decolonization Committee relating to the question of the Malvinas Islands. She referred in particular to General Assembly resolution 2065 (XX) et seq., which recognized the existence of a dispute between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom concerning sovereignty and requested them to resume bilateral negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful, just and definitive solution, taking into account the interests of the peoples of the Islands.

28. **Ms. García-Matos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her delegation could not support the draft resolution, because of its explicit reference in the seventh preambular paragraph to the World Summit outcome document (General Assembly resolution 60/1).

29. **Mr. Osmane** (Algeria) said that the right to self-determination, as an essential principle of international relations enshrined in international law, including the Charter, was a prerequisite for the enjoyment of all other human rights. It was therefore important for that right to be realized and for peoples subjected to colonial domination or foreign occupation to have the right to realize that inalienable right.

30. The United Nations owed its universality to decolonization, which had enabled the peoples of the

world, including Algerians, to free themselves from the yoke of colonialism, gain their independence, recover their dignity and find their place in the international community. However, decolonization remained incomplete: other peoples continued to demand from the international community their inalienable rights to self-determination and freedom. Algeria had made support for the right to self-determination of all peoples a cardinal principle of its foreign policy.

31. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should take note, in accordance with General Assembly decision 55/488, of the note by the Secretary-General on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination (A/60/263) and the note by the Secretariat on the use of mercenaries as a means of violating human rights and impeding the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination (A/60/319).

32. *It was so decided.*

33. **Mr. Wood** (United Kingdom) speaking in exercise of the right of reply to the statement made by the representative of Argentina, said that the position of his country was well known and had been recently set out in detail in a written right of reply by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom had no doubts about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and there could be no negotiations on their sovereignty unless and until such time as the islanders themselves made such a request.

Agenda item 71: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.29, L.34, L.35, L.49, L.50 and L.52/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.29: Combating defamation of religions

34. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

35. **Mr. Al-Subeihi** (Yemen), introducing draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.29 on behalf of the sponsors, said that it had been based on previous resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights, the Millennium Declaration and the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action. He also drew attention to the Global Agenda for Dialogue among Civilizations (General Assembly resolution 56/6).

36. **Mr. Elbadri** (Egypt) said that the draft resolution was not directed against any one country and did not infringe on the rights and freedoms of peoples in any way. Its sole purpose was to emphasize the importance of respect for the religions and beliefs of others, which were an integral part of the vision and way of life of many peoples.

37. **Mr. Woodroffe** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that religious intolerance was a matter of grave concern to European Union member States. The European Union had expressed its concern in the Commission on Human Rights regarding the approach, conceptual framework and terminology used in the texts of similar resolutions to combat religious discrimination and called for broader and more balanced texts. Discrimination based on religion or belief was a serious violation of human rights which was not limited to any one religion or part of the world. Freedom of thought, conscience, expression and religion must be respected at equal levels, and promoting respect for all religions and beliefs must be done in a comprehensive manner. As the general thrust of the draft resolution had remained unchanged, the European Union called for a vote and intended to vote against it.

Statements in explanation of vote before the voting

38. **Mr. Malhotra** (India) said that his delegation firmly opposed the defamation and negative stereotyping of any religion, including Islam, as well as attempts to link particular religions with terrorism. At the same time, there were instances of self-serving distortions of religions to justify the cult of violence and terrorism. Concerning the draft resolution, the twelfth preambular paragraph contained a reference to "non-Muslim countries" which was unclear. He recalled that there were countries with large Muslim populations like India with secular polities which could hardly be qualified as non-Muslim. Defamation and negative stereotyping were not confined to any single religion or belief. As the draft resolution contained many references to one religion only and failed to give equal focus to a problem faced by people of all faiths, it fell short of its stated purpose. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting.

39. **Ms. Zach** (United States of America) said that her country had been founded on the principle of freedom of religion. Every State must protect the right of its peoples to worship freely and to choose or change religions. Her delegation agreed with many of the general tenets of the draft resolution and deplored the denigration of religions. The draft resolution was incomplete, however, as it failed to address the situation of all religions. More inclusive language would have furthered the objective of promoting religious freedom. Furthermore, any resolution on the topic must include mention of the need to change educational systems which promoted hatred of particular religions or State-sponsored media which negatively targeted any one religion or people of a certain faith.

40. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Angola, Armenia, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, India, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Panama, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, United Republic of Tanzania.

41. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.29 was adopted by 88 votes to 52, with 23 abstentions.*

42. **Mr. Hamson** (Canada) said his delegation was concerned that the draft resolution had focused on religions themselves rather that the protection and promotion of the rights of adherents of religions, including persons belonging to religious minorities, and that it had stressed the protection of one religion above all others. The draft resolution confused racism with religious intolerance and failed to address the relationship between diversity and the fight against racism. Many of those concepts had been addressed in other resolutions. As the present draft resolution did not adequately deal with them, his delegation had voted against it.

43. **Mr. Ballestero** (Costa Rica) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as it dealt directly with an issue upon which the Organization had been founded. His delegation was concerned over the lack of consensus on the topic. He therefore appealed to the sponsors to take into account the concerns expressed over the singling out of one religion so that future such resolutions might be adopted by consensus.

44. **Ms. Serazzi** (Chile) said that her delegation believed that the fight against defamation of religions was important and had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Future resolutions on the topic, however, should address the defamation of not one religion but all faiths so that they could be adopted by consensus.

45. **Ms. Taracena Secaira** (Guatemala) said her delegation regretted that the draft resolution lacked balance and focused on one religion. It did not take into account the defamation of other religions and people who were victims of human-rights violations because they professed different faiths not officially recognized by the State. Given the importance of the issue, she hoped that future resolutions would be more inclusive and be able to be adopted by consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.34: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

46. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

47. *Ms. Tomič (Slovenia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

48. **Mr. Hamidon Ali** (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and China, which were sponsoring the draft resolution, expressed grave concern that unilateral coercive measures had brought negative consequences for developing countries and created additional obstacles to the enjoyment of human rights by the peoples of the affected States. Such measures hampered trade relations, social and economic development and the well-being of peoples.

49. The draft resolution urged States to refrain from unilateral coercive measures against other States with the aim of enforcing compliance, particularly where such measures were inconsistent with the Charter and international law.

50. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

51. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.34 was adopted by 121 to 52.*

52. *Mr. Butagira (Uganda) resumed the Chair.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.35: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

53. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

54. **Mr. Hamidon Ali** (Malaysia), speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and China,

which were sponsoring the draft resolution, said that the draft reaffirmed the importance of enhanced cooperation among Member States in the field of human rights. It also recognized that States had a collective responsibility to uphold the principles of human dignity, equality and equity at the global level.

55. *Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.35 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/59/L.49: Promotion of peace as a vital requirement for the full enjoyment of all human rights by all

56. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

57. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the original sponsors and also Bangladesh, Cambodia, Guinea and Turkmenistan said that paragraph 7 should be revised by deletion of the words "and encourages States to settle their disputes as early as possible".

58. Enjoyment of a climate of peace was a cornerstone for the establishment of an international order in which fundamental rights were fully exercised. The draft resolution contained elements that could help promote peace as a vital requirement for the enjoyment of all human rights; that had been questioned by some delegations, although reaffirmed by the United Nations, including in the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace. One of those components was the need for State policies to be directed at eliminating the threat of war and the use of force in international relations, and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, in accordance with the Charter; at abandoning the use of weapons that indiscriminately affected human health, the environment and economic and social well-being; and at allocating to development a part of the resources released as a result of disarmament accords.

59. **The Chairman** said that a recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

Explanation of vote before the voting

60. **Ms. Hart** (Canada) said that her delegation had requested the vote because the draft resolution was based on the Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace (General Assembly resolution 39/11), which Canada had not supported. While she noted that changes had been made to the draft, several questions and concerns remained, in particular regarding the concept of the right of peoples to peace, including the content of that right and the specific obligations of States in respect of its implementation.

61. In addition, the draft resolution focused in international relations among States, rather than on the obligation of States to respect the human rights of their citizens. It also dealt with matters — including international peace and security and disarmament — which were more appropriately dealt with in other forums. Her delegation regretted that those concerns had not been addressed in the draft resolution, but would be happy to work with the sponsors in order to achieve a consensus text in future. For those reasons, Canada would vote against the draft resolution.

62. **Mr. Woodroffe** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; and, in addition, Iceland, Liechtenstein, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine said the draft resolution presumed that peace was a prerequisite for the realization of human rights. It also dealt only with the relationship among States, rather than that between a State and its citizens, which was the core mandate of the Third Committee, as well as of the Commission on Human Rights. While underlining the linkage between peace and the enjoyment of human rights, the European Union believed that a number of the issues raised in the draft resolution were better dealt with in other forums. The European Union would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

63. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar,

Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Chile, Equatorial Guinea, India, Mexico, Samoa, Singapore.

64. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.49, as orally revised, was adopted by 113 votes to 51, with 8 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.50: Respect for the principles of national sovereignty and diversity of democratic systems in electoral processes as an important element for the promotion and protection of human rights

65. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

66. **Mr. Cumberbatch Miguén** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Cambodia, the Central African Republic, Mauritania, Pakistan, Rwanda, the Syrian Arab Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania and Turkmenistan. The draft resolution recognized the diversity of democratic political systems and models of electoral processes based on national and regional characteristics, and reaffirmed that democracy, sustainable development, human rights and good governance were mutually dependent. The draft resolution also reaffirmed the right of peoples to determine their electoral processes and form of democracy.

67. *At the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Israel, Marshall Islands, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia,

Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay.

68. *Draft resolution A/60/C.3/L.50 was adopted by 106 votes to 4, with 61 abstentions.*

69. **Ms. García Matos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela), speaking in explanation of vote said that her delegation had co-sponsored the draft resolution. She drew attention to paragraph 5, which had been included to prevent other States from financing political parties or other organizations in order to undermine the legitimacy of Governments constitutionally elected through a transparent electoral process.

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.52/Rev.1: The right to food

70. **The Chairman** said that adoption of the draft resolution would not entail any additional appropriation.

71. **Mr. Cumberbatch Miguén** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Afghanistan, Andorra, Armenia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Colombia, the Comoros, Egypt, Finland, France, Honduras, India, Italy, Mauritania, Mozambique, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Seychelles, Suriname, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

72. The aim of the revised draft resolution was to make a further contribution to the global fight against hunger. It was the outcome of intensive consultations. He announced a further revision in which the words "pervasive discrimination" in paragraph 8 should be replaced by the words "continuous discrimination" in order to enable one more delegation to join the sponsors.

73. **The Chairman** announced that a recorded vote had been requested.

74. **Ms. Zach** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that her delegation had requested the recorded vote and could not support the draft resolution. The United States had proven by its actions its profound commitment to promoting food security around the world; over 60 per cent of international food aid came as a gift from the people of the United States. Although the Government agreed with some parts of the draft resolution, its consistent position was that the attainment of any right to adequate food and right to be free from hunger was a goal to be realized progressively and did not derive from any international obligation nor diminish the responsibility of Governments towards their own citizens.

75. Her delegation found that the draft resolution, like its predecessors, contained numerous objectionable provisions, including inaccurate textual descriptions of the underlying right. In addition, the draft resolution commended the work of the Special Rapporteur, with which her delegation disagreed in many respects. The Special Rapporteur continued to use his reports as a forum for advancing novel legal assertions on food-related issues which were founded neither on international law nor on substance.

76. She reiterated her delegation's appeal to the Special Rapporteur to use his time and energy to deal with the issue in a pragmatic and results-oriented manner. She hoped that in future years the sponsors would accommodate the United States concerns so that it could join in the adoption of a draft resolution on the important subject of the right to food.

77. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea,

Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel.

78. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.52/Rev.1 was adopted by 171 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/60/L.46)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.46: Situation of human rights in Turkmenistan

79. **Mr. Marsh** (United States of America), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, Japan, Liechtenstein, Palau, Republic of Moldova, and Switzerland. Following consultations with the delegation of Turkmenistan, he wished to introduce a number of revisions.

80. In the fifth preamabular paragraph, the words "of September 2005" should be inserted after "*Welcoming* the report" and, after "human rights issues", the phrase "and has shown readiness to cooperate with the international community" should be inserted. In paragraph 1 (a), "their full realization" should be corrected to read "the full realization". In paragraph 1 (i), after "permanent resident status", the words "more than 16,000 refugees, including" should be added. Paragraph 2 (d) should be replaced by: "The Government of Turkmenistan's failure to grant access to detainees to the International Committee of the Red Cross, according to the usual terms of the Committee, as well as to international monitors". Paragraphs 2 (m) and 2 (n) were to be deleted. Paragraph 3 (d) should be replaced by: "To follow through on the presentation of the Government of Turkmenistan to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in April 2004 and the meetings between the Government of Turkmenistan and the International Committee of the Red Cross in 2005 by finalizing an agreement allowing the Committee to visit Turkmen prisons with full and repeated access to all places of detention in accordance with the usual modalities for that organization, and by providing international monitors, lawyers and relatives with full and repeated access to all those in detention, including those convicted of involvement in the coup attempt of 25 November 2002".

81. He welcomed the steps taken by the Government of Turkmenistan to address issues of concern to the international community but noted that serious problems remained. The Government did not allow dissent, silenced those who opposed its leadership, and regulated religious practices. While it continued to engage in constructive dialogue with the international community, it had failed to take action. As the people

of Turkmenistan could not speak out against the repressive practices that silenced them, the international community must make it clear to them that it understood their situation and was using the mechanisms available to expose and improve it.

82. **The Chairman** said that Iceland had joined the sponsors.

83. **Mr. Ali** (Malaysia) reiterated the conviction of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that human-rights issues should be addressed through a constructive, dialogue-based approach showing respect for national sovereignty, and should not be exploited for political ends. He therefore opposed country-specific resolutions and called on those States that engaged in the practice of "naming and shaming" to desist. Selective targeting was unhelpful and led only to confrontation.

84. **Mr. Arziev** (Uzbekistan) said that his country likewise opposed country-specific resolutions and favoured dialogue and transparency. He referred to the final communiqué of the 2005 Meeting of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, in which they had expressed their opposition to such resolutions as contributing to the politicization of human rights.

85. **Mr. Swe** (Myanmar) said that his country, as a matter of principle, opposed the selective targeting of developing countries for political reasons on the pretext of human rights. He stressed the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that human rights should not be used as a means of political pressure against developing countries. His delegation would therefore express its solidarity with Turkmenistan by rejecting the draft resolution.

86. **Mr. Cumberbatch Miguén** (Cuba) said that such resolutions did nothing to advance the human rights agenda. They were an act of cynicism on the part of a country that used chemical weapons against civilians and tortured prisoners in obscure jails, refusing to let international inspectors have access to them and offending Muslims all over the world. Such double standards had led to the collapse of the Commission on Human Rights and would, if they continued to be practised in the new Human Rights Council, undermine it from the outset. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution.

87. **Ms. Ataeva** (Turkmenistan) said that, over the past year, her Government had taken steps to promote human rights, and had invited the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit Turkmenistan. It was finalizing an agreement on cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross. It was enhancing democratic processes, and allowed all religious organizations to register. It had recently decided to grant citizenship, residence permits, housing assistance and social-welfare services to 16,000 refugees. Those developments were not adequately reflected in the draft resolution which contained unsubstantiated and subjective views. It was not a constructive response to Turkmenistan's willingness to cooperate; rather, it was a means of pressure.

88. She therefore moved the adjournment of the debate on the draft resolution, in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure. Such a rejection of selectivity, double standards and the politicization of human rights would be a step towards reforming the United Nations human-rights machinery. She stressed that the position expressed by countries in the vote would also reflect their position with regard to the new Human Rights Council. The question was whether it would be a truly representative and democratic body or simply a tool of the developed countries.

89. **The Chairman** invited two representatives to speak in favour of, and two against, the motion before putting it to the vote, in accordance with rule 116.

90. **Mr. Xie** Bohua (China) supported the motion. His country had consistently held that differences between countries on human rights should be resolved through dialogue. The use of country-specific resolutions to name and shame only led to confrontation. The Third Committee should reject such practices.

91. **Ms. Núñez de Odremán** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) also disagreed with the practice of targeting particular States, which ran counter to the principles of respect for the sovereignty of States and non-interference in their domestic affairs. The way forward lay in dialogue and cooperation. She would therefore vote in favour of the motion.

92. **Mr. Marsh** (United States of America) urged Member States to consider the draft resolution on its merits and to vote against the motion. It was aimed at blocking the free expression of ideas and was therefore contrary to article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The possibility of open debate was a

fundamental principle of democracy. Countries that complained of country-specific resolutions also criticized particular countries in other Third Committee resolutions. The United Nations was designed to serve as a forum for considering human-rights abuses, extending beyond the possibilities offered by bilateral relations. The motion to silence discussion should not be allowed.

93. **Mr. Lonsdale** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that, as a matter of principle, the European Union voted against any motion to adjourn the debate on an item under discussion. Any such motion ran counter to the spirit of dialogue and would prevent the Third Committee from giving serious consideration to the issues addressed. It could not be allowed to ignore those issues; in the case of Turkmenistan, they required real action if that country was to meet its international obligations.

94. As for the charge of double standards levelled at those who believed it right to discuss serious and systematic human-rights violations by particular countries, the European Union could not agree to an exclusive focus on standard-setting and cooperation, as important as they were. Standards had to be implemented, and when they were not, action should be taken. He urged delegations to vote against the motion, regardless of their voting intentions on the draft resolution.

95. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposal to adjourn the debate on draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.46.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, Gambia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Brazil, Burundi, Cape Verde, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay.

96. *The proposal to adjourn the debate on draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.46 was rejected by 70 votes to 64, with 26 abstentions.*

Statements of explanation of vote before the voting

97. **Mr. Taranda** (Belarus) said that Belarus was consistently opposed to country-specific resolutions out of respect for the sovereignty of States. It believed in a non-confrontational approach and considered such resolutions to be counter-productive.

98. **Mr. Pak** Tok Hun (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) expressed concern about the continual submission of such draft resolutions. Turkmenistan had shown a willingness to cooperate; confrontation was being sought for political reasons. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

99. **Mr. Saeed** (Sudan) rejected selective, partial approaches that targeted developing countries. No attention was paid to the human-rights situation of developed countries, which claimed to be protectors of human rights. No good would come of using human rights as a "sword of Damocles" over the heads of developing countries. Such resolutions undermined the ongoing reform. He hoped that the new Human Rights Council would favour dialogue over selectivity and double standards. His country would vote against the draft resolution.

100. **Mr. Arziev** (Uzbekistan) said that he would likewise vote against the draft resolution. It was not possible to trust the sponsors' knowledge of the human-rights situation in a country when they made mistakes in its place names. The draft resolution would tie the hands of Turkmenistan just as it was seeking cooperation; it would divide the international community.

101. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.46.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Gambia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, India, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

102. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.46, as orally revised, was adopted by 70 votes to 38, with 58 abstentions.*•

103. **Mr. Chew** (Singapore), speaking in explanation of vote, said that country-specific resolutions were driven by political rather than human-rights considerations and for that reason Singapore consistently abstained from voting on them, as it had on the draft resolution just adopted. He nevertheless questioned the concerns reflected in paragraphs 1 (b) and 3 (a). Singapore did not consider conscientious objection to military service to be a right; national defence was a sovereign right under international law, and the right of the State to national security must prevail.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

• The delegation of Namibia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to abstain.